

REMARKS

Applicant is amending Claims 56-64 and 78-79 to change “self-light emitting display device” to “light emitting display device” in order to better claim the present invention.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner’s objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner continues to reject Claim 56 (and apparently Claims 59-62 and 64) under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Abe (US 6,617,784). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 56 is directed to a self-light emitting display device wherein “an angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60° and is less than 180°.” This is illustrated, for example, in Fig. 4A of the present application which shows the second surface of the substrate 301 and the light scattering body 302, wherein the angle between the light scattering body and the second surface corresponds to inner angle θ_3 or θ_4 . See also e.g. pages 6-7 of the present application.

In contrast, col. 3, lns. 60-65 of Abe (which is cited by the Examiner in support of his rejection in the Office Action) is directed to the apex (i.e. the uppermost point) of the prism. This is different from the claimed invention.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner agrees with Applicant that Abe discloses the apex or the uppermost point of the prism to be between 70 to 120 degrees. The Examiner, however, contends that the prism in Abe forms an isosceles triangle, and that the prism and alleged second surface form two angles, one (the inner) which is 30-55 degrees and the second (the outer) which is 125-150

degrees. The Examiner then argues that Applicant merely claims that an angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than 180 degrees. The Examiner interprets this angle to be the second (outer) angle of 125-150 degrees in Abe and that satisfies the claimed range.

While Applicant disagrees and believes that the present invention and claims are clearly different and distinguishable over Abe, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended independent Claim 56 to recite “inner” before “angle” (i.e. “wherein an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60° and is less than 180°”). This clearly distinguishes the claimed invention from Abe which shows the inner angle having a range of 30-55 degrees which is outside the claimed range.

Therefore, independent Claim 56 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 57 and 58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Jones (US 5,920,080), Claim 63 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Shibata (US 6,147,451), and Claim 78 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Duggal (US 6,777,871). These rejections are also respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, independent Claim 78 has been amended as discussed above to recite “wherein an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60° and is less than 180°.” Hence, for at least the reasons

discussed above, this claim is also patentable over the cited references.

Each of the other rejected claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 1, 2005



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568